UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,257	08/20/2003	Wai Yim	AP172HO	6091

20178 7590 06/18/2007

EPSON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT INC
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPT
2580 ORCHARD PARKWAY, SUITE 225
SAN JOSE, CA 95131

EXAMINER	
TSUI, WILSON W	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/644,257	YIM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Wilson Tsui	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 March 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *20 August 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on: 3/22/2007.

2. Claims 1, 3, 7, 14, 17, 20, and 21 have been amended. Claims 1, 7, 14, and 20 are independent claims, and claims 1-21 are pending.

3. The 35 112 rejections with respect to claims 1-21 are withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.

4. Claims 1-3, 14-17, 20, and 21 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Syncomatic, in further view of Lin, claims 4, 5, 18, and 19 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Syncomatic and Lin, in further view of Silver et al, claims 6 -10 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Syncomatic and Lin, in further view of de Queiroz et al, claims 11-13 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Syncomatic, Lin, and de Queiroz et al, in further view of Silver et al

Drawings

5. The drawings filed on: 08/20/2003 are accepted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-3, 14-17, 20, and 21 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Syncomatic (Syncomatic Online Documentation, published: May

2006, Section: 'Syncomatic Style files' (pages: 1-4), Section: 'Producing a Lecture Using Sync-O-Matic 2000' (pages 1-20), in further view of Lin (US Patent: 6,369,835 B1, issued: Apr. 9, 2002, filed: May 18, 1999).

With regards to claim 1, Syncomatic teaches:

- *Opening a PPT presentation file*: as explained in section: 'Producing a Lecture Using Sync-O-Matic 2000' page 4-5 (whereas, a PowerPoint file is opened for analysis and conversion).
- *Parsing the PPT presentation file to identify each presentation slide and to identify* one or more *presentation object*(s) *presented in each presentation slide*: as explained in section: 'Sync-O-Matic Style Files' page 3: whereas, PowerPoint files have been parsed, and information extracted from presentation objects such as image map data, or text data)
- *Generating a first compressed single image format image capturing a presentation object in a first presentation slide of the PPT presentation file*: (section: 'Producing a Lecture Using Sync-O-Matic 2000', pages 3-5: whereas, a compressed GIF image file is generated, capturing presentation content/objects in a first presentation slide of the PPT presentation file).

However, Syncomatic does not expressly teach

- *Identifying each presentation object* presented in each presentation slide during parsing and g*enerating a second compressed single image format image capturing the presentation object in the first presentation slide of the PPT presentation file, wherein the first compressed single image format image*

captures the presentation object before an effect is applied and the second compressed single image format image captures an end-point of the effect applied to the presentation object.

Lin teaches a method comprising:

- *Identifying each presentation object* presented in each presentation slide during parsing (Abstract: "Objects in the slide show presentation are identified and automatically transformed ...")
- *Generating a second compressed single image format image capturing the presentation object in the first presentation slide of the PPT presentation file, wherein the first compressed single image format image captures the presentation object before an effect is applied and the second compressed single image format image captures an end-point of the effect applied to the presentation object* (whereas, as explained in Fig. 14, each object/shape in the presentation file is captured, by including a video sample to capture the beginning and endpoint effects for each identified presentation object/shape. As shown in Fig. 2, the method of capture is through frame-based video (reference number 66). Since a frame is a single image amongst a sequence of other images in a video, and the video (which includes all frames) can be compressed through MPEG compression (column 7, lines 60-67), then a first compressed image is generated to show the a presentation object before an effect, and a second compressed image is generated after an effect as taught by Fig 14 reference 350).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Syncomatic's method for parsing and generating compressed image files, to have further included the ability to generated images which captures the presentation object in the first presentation slide in a first image, and capturing the end-point effect applied to the presentation object in a second image, as taught by Lin. The combination of Syncomatic and Lin would have allowed Syncomatic to have provided for an output presentation/format which is more universal such that it wouldn't be necessary "for an application program [to] recognize the file format of the presentation program ... [or] ... [have] the presentation program installed on a computer before the slide show may be viewed" (Lin, column 2, lines 24-30).

With regards to claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Lin teaches a method for identifying presentation objects, and generating equivalent compressed image(s), as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1. Additionally, Lin further teaches the method for identifying and generating compressed images, includes *identifying an animated GIF object; examining each image in the animated GIF object; and selecting an image from the examined animated GIF object for rendering as a compressed single image format image* (column 21, lines 56-60: whereas, an image is selected from an Animated GIF object, and transformed into a image. Additionally, the image may be compressed through MPEG compression as explained earlier in the rejection for claim 1).

With regards to claim 3, which depends on claim 1, Lin teaches identifying presentation objects in the rejection for claim 1. Lin further teaches the identification of presentation objects includes identifying presentation object attributes, the presentation object

attributes including presentation effects assigned to a presentation object (Fig 14: whereas, vector data/attributes for each object/shape is included).

With regards to claim 14, Syncomatic and Lin similarly teaches *program instructions for parsing the PPT presentation file; program instructions for identifying each presentation slide in the PPT presentation file; program instructions for identifying a presentation object in each presentation slide in the PPT presentation file; program instructions for determining whether the presentation object has presentation effects; program instructions for generating a first compressed image file showing the presentation object; and program instructions for generating a second compressed image file showing the presentation object having the effect applied*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 15, which depends on claim 14, Syncomatic and Lin similarly teaches program instructions *for identifying an animated GIF object; program instructions for analyzing each image of the animated GIF object; program instructions for selecting a single image of the animated GIF object; and program instructions for generating a compressed image file showing the selected single image of the animated GIF object*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 2, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 16, which depends on claim 14, Syncomatic and Lin similarly teaches *determining whether the presentation object has presentation effects includes examining any attributes assigned to the presentation object*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 3, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 17, which depends on claim 14, Syncomatic and Lin similarly teaches *program instructions for generating a plurality of compressed image files for each presentation slide in the PPT presentation file, wherein the plurality of compressed image files illustrate an end effect for each presentation object having an effect*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 20, Syncomatic and Lin similarly teaches *logic for reading the PPT presentation file; logic for parsing the PPT presentation file; logic for identifying each presentation slide in the PPT presentation file; logic for identifying each presentation object in each presentation slide; logic for generating a first compressed image file showing a presentation object without a presentation effect applied; and logic for generating a second compressed image file showing an end effect of a presentation object having an effect applied*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 21, which depends on claim 20, Syncomatic and Lin similarly teaches *logic for generating a plurality of compressed image files for each presentation slide in the PPT presentation file, wherein the plurality of compressed image files illustrate an end effect for each presentation object having a presentation effect*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under similar rationale.

7. Claims 4, 5, 18, and 19 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Syncomatic (Syncomatic Online Documentation, published: May 2006, Section: 'Syncomatic Style files' (pages: 1-4), Section: 'Producing a Lecture Using Sync-O-Matic 2000' (pages 1-20) and Lin (US Patent: 6,369,835 B1, issued: Apr. 9,

2002, filed: May 18, 1999), in further view of Silver et al (US Patent: 6,408,109 B1, issued: Jun. 18, 2002, filed: Oct. 7, 1996)

With regards to claim 4, which depends on claim 2, Lin teaches wherein the examining of each image in the animated GIF object, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 2, and is rejected under similar rationale. However, the combination of Syncomatic and Lin do not expressly teach including an application of a Roberts Cross operator to each image.

However, Silver et al teaches including an application of a Roberts Cross Operator to each image (Abstract: whereas an image is analyzed to detect the maximum/highest gradient magnitude for edge detection. The edge detection process, includes gradient estimation through Roberts Cross as shown in Fig. 1a, and explained in column 6, 30-35).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Syncomatic and Lin's system for selecting an image for an animated GIF, such that the image is selected based upon the application of a Roberts Cross operator, as taught by Silver et al. The combination would have allowed Syncomatic to have "implemented an inexpensive method of high accuracy subpixel edge detection" (Silver, column 2, lines 49-50).

With regards to claim 5, which depends on claim 4, the combination of Syncomatic, Lin, and Silver et al teaches wherein the selecting of an image from the examined animated GIF object for rendering as a compressed single image format image includes identifying the image with a highest spatial gradient measurement computed by the

application of the Roberts Cross operator, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 4, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 18, which depends on claim 15, Syncomatic, Lin, and Silver et al teaches wherein the analyzing each image of the animated GIF object includes applying a Roberts Cross operator to each image of the animated GIF object, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 4, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 19, which depends on claim 18, Syncomatic, Lin, and Silver et al teaches wherein the selecting the single image of the examined animated GIF object includes identifying an image with a highest spatial gradient measurement computed by the application of the Roberts Cross operator, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 5, and is rejected under similar rationale.

8. Claims 6 -10 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Syncomatic (Syncomatic Online Documentation, published: May 2006, Section: 'Syncomatic Style files' (pages: 1-4), Section: 'Producing a Lecture Using Sync-O-Matic 2000' (pages 1-20) and Lin (US Patent: 6,369,835 B1, issued: Apr. 9, 2002, filed: May 18, 1999), in further view of de Queiroz et al (US Patent: 6,058,210, issued: May 2, 2000, filed: Sep. 15, 1997)

With regards to claim 6, which depends on claim 1, Lin teaches the first compressed single image format image and the second compressed single image format image is in GIF format. Lin further teaches the first and second image format can be other compression formats as well (column 12, lines 36-43).

However, the combination of Syncomatic and Lin do not expressly teach the compression format is *JPEG*.

Yet, de Queiroz et al teaches the compression format in a motion video, can be MJPEG, which means each image in the view frame is stored in *compressed JPEG format* (column 2, lines 4-9).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Syncomatic and Lin's powerpoint to image transformation system, such that the image stored is in JPEG format, as taught by de Queiroz et al. The combination of Syncomatic, Lin, and de Queiroz et al would have allowed Syncomatic to have implemented a moving picture by digitizing a sequence of still image frames, ... where each frame is compressed using the JPEG standard" (de Queiroz et al, column 2, lines 4-8).

With regards to claim 7, the combination of Syncomatic and Lin teach identifying each presentation slide in the PPT presentation file; identifying each presentation object in each presentation slide; determining whether each presentation object in each presentation slide has effects applied, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under similar rationale. Additionally, the combination of Syncomatic and Lin teach determining whether each presentation object in each presentation slide is an animated GIF object and rendering an image for each animated GIF object, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 2, and is rejected under similar rationale; Additionally, Lin teaches generating an image from an animated GIF object in the rejection for claim 2, and further teaches the image is placed into an image buffer (claim

21, line 60: whereas, the image is placed into movie data/video data. As explained in the rejection for claim 1, movie/video data is basically a sequence/buffer of frames/images); and generating a JPEG image format file to show an end effect for any presentation object having effects applied, as similarly explained by the combination of Syncomatic, Lin, and de Queiroz et al in the rejection for claim 6, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 8, which depends on claim 7, Syncomatic, Lin, and de Queiroz et al teaches wherein the determining whether each presentation object in each presentation slide has effects applied includes an examination of any attributes assigned to each presentation object in each presentation slide, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 3, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 9, which depends on claim 7, Syncomatic, Lin, and de Queiroz et al teaches wherein the determining whether each presentation object in each presentation slide is an animated GIF object, includes an examination of any attributes assigned to each presentation object in each presentation slide (Lin, column 21, lines 56-60: whereas, the act of transforming an animated GIF object to include as an image in movie data, inherently includes determining/recognizing the attributes of the presentation object/GIF object before transformation, in order to successfully map/transform the animated GIF to an image)

With regards to claim 10, which depends on claim 9, Syncomatic, Lin, and de Queiroz et al teaches examining each image in the animated GIF object; selecting an image in the animated GIF object to render into the image buffer (as similarly explained in the

rejection for claim 2, and rejected under similar rationale); and rendering the selected image into the image buffer (as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 7, and is rejected under similar rationale).

9. Claims 11-13 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Syncomatic (Syncomatic Online Documentation, published: May 2006, Section: 'Syncomatic Style files' (pages: 1-4), Section: 'Producing a Lecture Using Sync-O-Matic 2000' (pages 1-20), Lin (US Patent: 6,369,835 B1, issued: Apr. 9, 2002, filed: May 18, 1999), and de Queiroz et al (US Patent: 6,058,210, issued: May 2, 2000, filed: Sep. 15, 1997), in further view of Silver et al (US Patent: 6,408,109 B1, issued: Jun. 18, 2002, filed: Oct. 7, 1996)

With regards to claim 11, which depends on claim 10, the combination of Syncomatic, Lin, and de Queiroz et al teach *the examining each image in the animation GIF object*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 10, and is rejected under similar rationale, However, Syncomatic, Lin, and de Queiroz et al do not expressly teach *identifying a most complex image in the animated GIF object.*

However, Silver et al teaches *identifying a most complex image in the animated GIF object.*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 5, and is rejected under similar rationale.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the combination of Syncomatic, Lin, and de Queiroz et al to have further included identifying a most complex image in the animated GIF object, as taught by Silver et al. The combination would have allowed Silver et al to have

"implemented an inexpensive method of high accuracy subpixel edge detection" (Silver, column 2, lines 49-50)."

With regards to claim 12, which depends on claim 10, Syncomatic, Lin, and de Queiroz et al teaches *examining each image in the animated GIF,* as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 10. Furthermore, Silver et al teaches identifying the most complex image, as explained in the rejection for claim 11. Silver et al further teaches the identifying the most complex image includes *wherein the examining each image in the animated GIF object includes an application of a Roberts Cross operator to measure a spatial gradient of each image* in the animated GIF object, as explained in the rejection for claim 4, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 13, which depends on claim 12, Syncomatic, Lin, and de Queiroz et al teaches *wherein the selecting the image in the animated GIF object to render into the image buffer*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 10. The combination of Syncomatic, Lin, de Queiroz et al, and Silver et al also teach identifying of the most complex image, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 11. Silver et al further teaches the *identifying of the most complex image includes selecting the image having a highest spatial gradient sum obtained by the application of the Roberts Cross operator*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 4, and is rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 3/22/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

11. First the applicant argues that Syncomatic provides no teaching as to how a program converts slides in a power point file to a corresponding series of GIF images. However, this is not persuasive since as explained in page 3 of the Sync-O-matic style files: "Sync-O-Matic parses the PowerPoint materials and extracts information about each slide". Thus, data is read/extracted from the slides, and then the data is used to convert a power point file to a corresponding series of GIF images, by opening/parsing the power point file as explained in page 4 of the 'Producing a Lecture Using Sync-O-matic 2000' reference. Additionally, after the powerpoint file is selected, and the data extracted from the power point file (as previously explained above), the information is then used to convert to a corresponding series of GIF images, as explained in page 1 of the Sync-O-matic style files, "the Sync-O-Mat [use the following steps to produce a lecture", which includes parsing the power point files, and going through the style files. Pages 1-5 of the 'Producing a Lecture Using Sync-O-matic 2000' reference, further shows some of the additional steps to producing a lecture includes converting information to a corresponding series of GIF images. Thus, Sync-O-matic does teach how (through a manner of steps, and style files) data from a power point presentation is read to produce a corresponding series of GIF images, and the applicant's argument is there non-persuasive.

12. Secondly the applicant argues that "while a GIF image may be compressed, its native state is an uncompressed bit map, and thus, there is no conversion of a presentation file into a compressed single image file. However, the applicant is arguing the native state of a GIF, and not the final resulting state of producing a GIF. As

explained/taught in page 5 of the 'Producing a Lecture Using Sync-O-matic 2000' reference, GIFs are *produced* as GIF files. As known in the art, the production of a GIF file employs LZW compression, as also supported by the Microsoft Computer Dictionary, whereas the definition of GIF includes: "A graphics file format developed by CompuServe and used for transmitting raster images on the Internet, ... the LZW compression method is used to reduced the file size" (Microsoft Computer Dictionary, page 235). Additionally, as www.wikipedia.org further explains a GIF as a compressed image file: "GIF became popular because it used LZW data compression" (www.wikipedia.org , page 1). Thus, without further proof/evidence by the applicant, with regards to a GIF being uncompressed, the applicant's argument is non-persuasive.

13. Third, the applicant argues that "the Syncomatic process ... [when] a GIF is encountered in the conversion process, it is apparently copied into the destination directory without conversion, since GIF is the destination format, [which is] "markedly different from applicants' claimed invention, which involves processing each presentation object, such as a GIF object, that is animated or to which an effect is applied to generate the compressed image files". However, this argument is not persuasive, since the claim language does not require that every single object identified in each slide goes through a compression process, only that '*a* presentation object in a first presentation slide' is specified, not '*for each* presentation object in a first presentation slide'.

14. Fourth, the applicant recites limitations from claims 1, 7, 14, and 20, and then proceeds to say that 'Syncomatic does not teach any of these claimed features, and

non of the secondary references offsets this lack of teaching'. However, the examiner respectfully points out that the applicant argues that the cited limitations are not taught, but provides not explanation, or evidence, as to why the limitations are not taught. Thus, the applicant's argument is not persuasive.

15. Fifth, the applicant argues that "MPEG frames, however are not the same as compressed single images, such as JPEG images. Indeed, if such were the case, MPEG would be unnecessary". However, the examiner points out as well known in the art, and as taught by Lin; a movie/video file is merely a storage collection comprising a sequence of single images (frames), played/sequenced such that an animation/movie/moving-image is produced (Lin, Fig 2, whereas, the method of capture is frame based video (reference number 66). Also as explained, in column 7, lines 60-66, MPEG is necessary to "compress the *contents* [frames] of a *movie file*". Thus, the applicant's argument is not persuasive.

The applicant further argues that MPEG uses block-based motion compensated prediction, whereas JPEG does not; and JPEG is more general purpose than MPEG in terms of applicable color spaces, and considering the destination formats between the claimed invention and Lin are different, there is no reason to believe that the processing would be the same. However, as supported by the applicant, that JPEG is more generic in its features (lack of motion-based compensation prediction or color space implementation) than MPEG, merely affirms that the collection of collection of compressed image files are implemented as a subset of MPEG feature/functionality, in order to produce various effects, such as the effects explained in the rejection for claim

1, above. Both Lin and the claimed invention process a collection of compressed images, to show transition/effects (Lin, Fig. 6: whereas a frame based translation/effect is implemented), and the frames/movie-file-content are compressed; as explained in the rejection and the response to arguments sections above. Thus, Lin and the claimed invention are analogous to the art of compressed image processing and effects generation, and the applicant's argument is not persuasive, since the combination of Lin and Sync-O-matic is used to produce compressed images showing effect(s), not just Lin by itself.

16. Sixth, the applicant argues, with respect to claim 7, that de Queiroz contains no teaching regarding conversion of a presentation file, which is a relatively special format, and which is also the starting point of applicant's invention, and thus accordingly there is no basis for using de Queiroz to modify either Syncomatic or Lin. However, In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, de Queiroz, Lin, and Syncomatic all deal with compressed images. The combination of Sync-O-matic and Lin teach the required presentation file processing, as explained in the above rejection and response to arguments. Sync-O-Matic and Lin's compressed image processing, is then

modified with de Queiroz (which de Queiroz is of the same image processing art, as explained in column 1, lines 45-55: whereas, compressed image sequence processing is implemented). Thus, the applicant's argument is not persuasive.

17. Seventh, the applicant argues that claims 4, 5, 18, and 19 are allowable, since they are dependent on allowable claims (that were previously argued above). However, the claims above in the response to arguments have been shown/explained to be rejected, and the applicant's argument is thus not persuasive.

Conclusion

18. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wilson Tsui whose telephone number is (571)272-7596. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

W.T. 06/08/07

Wilson Tsui
Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 2178
June 8, 2007

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER